

**U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

# **STOCKTAKING OF REFORMS IN AGENCY PROGRAM OPERATIONS**

## **DOCUMENT ANALYSIS**

**April 1998**

**Chanya Charles, PPC/CDIE/DI Research and Reference Services  
in collaboration with Liz Baltimore, John Haecker, and Peggy Schultz  
and assistance from the USAID Research and Reference Services Project**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction . . . . .	3
II. Methodology . . . . .	5
Gathering Documents	
Sorting Documents	
Analyzing Data	
III. Findings . . . . .	7
Overview of Documents	
Specific Content	
Discussion	
IV. Bibliography . . . . .	16
APPENDIX A: Outcome Areas . . . . .	24
APPENDIX B: Empowered Staff and Teams Accountable for Results . . . . .	25
APPENDIX C: Addressing Development Needs through Customers and Partners . . . . .	36
APPENDIX D: Results-Oriented Decision-Making . . . . .	41
APPENDIX E: Responsive and Flexible Approaches for Achieving . . . . .	43

## **STOCKTAKING OF REFORMS DOCUMENT ANALYSIS**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The stocktaking/diagnostic began in November 1997 to provide an assessment of the implementation and impact of the reforms in Agency operations. The effort was intended to guide senior management decisions on actions to clarify, refine, and accelerate reform and realize the Administrator's vision of a reinvented, more effective USAID. A stocktaking study team, drawn from PPC/CDIE and PPC/ROR and assisted by CDIE's Research and Reference Services, and external advisors was formed to gather and assess information centering on four outcome areas. These outcome areas were designed to capture the fundamental results expected from the reforms. The outcome areas are 1) empowered staff and teams accountable for results, 2) addressing development needs through customers and partners, 3) results-oriented decision-making, and 4) responsive and flexible approaches for achieving. The reengineering stocktaking team used three methods for gathering information to contribute to a snapshot of the impact of the reforms and the state of the Agency's program operations system. The three methods are a survey, document review, and focus groups and interviews.

Survey - The survey was based on a results framework for changing operations. It was based on indicators and defines a baseline (the current state) for managing change for operations. Within the area of operations (and some other areas that interact with them) the survey identifies sub-areas for intervention and/or sub-areas for additional, targeted research/evaluation. It identifies recommended actions and best practices by frequency of mention. Within the list of recommended actions it identifies management options by frequency of mention to the extent that respondents see management of the change effort as an obstacle to implementing reforms. 580 people responded to the survey. 272 people were part of a random sample, 66 respondents were part of a targeted group, and 208 were self-selected. Interestingly, there was very little difference between the results of the random sample and the total respondents.

Document Review - The document review provides information on USAID's change efforts and reaction to these efforts. It also provides indicator data and additional insight for those "why" and "why not" questions raised by the survey. It contributes to recommended actions and identifies possible resources/best practices, including management options, to augment those generated by the survey. Seventy-three documents, (including evaluation reports, memorandums, and minutes) were analyzed. Thirty-two of the documents were produced in Washington, 38 were from the regions or regional bureaus, and three were non-USAID documents.

Focus Groups and Interviews - Focus groups and interviews provide more in-depth perspectives on USAID's vision for the change effort and implementation program. They

provide informed opinion on the current state for specific areas of intervention and on targeted sub-areas within operations.

This paper describes the methodology and findings of the document analysis. It is important to note that the Agency does not regularly collect information on assessments of the reforms. There is no central location or database to find information on implementation and impact of Agency reforms. Written information was pulled from all corners of the Agency, but it is impossible to know what was missed. The snapshot created by these documents, therefore, provides only one angle of the whole picture. The stocktaking synthesis report that combines this data with the analysis of the survey data, focus groups, and interviews provides a more thorough and complete perspective.

## II. METHODOLOGY

### Gathering Documents

1. Obtained key documents identified by stocktaking/diagnostic team members.
2. Obtained USAID series or articles related to reengineering.
3. Obtained documents from USAID Development Information Clearinghouse through the following steps:
  - a. Database search of USAID Development Experience System (DEXS) under "abstract" category using key terms: *core values*, *managing for results*, *teamwork*, *customer focus*, *reengineering*, and *reforms* on evaluation documents from 1995 to present. Collected abstracts for over 100 documents based on these criteria.
  - b. Reviewed abstracts for information on discussion or lessons learned regarding how the Agency operating system worked for the particular activity. Twenty-four of the abstracts contained this type of information.
  - c. Obtained the full text of these 24 documents.
4. Obtained documents from USAID Global Bureau sectors and regional bureaus through the following steps:
  - a. Research and Reference Services staff responsible for sectors and regions contacted USAID direct hire staff by telephone and e-mail asking for documents that contain current assessments of the Agency's reengineered program operations system.
  - b. Obtained these documents.

Over 100 documents were obtained. These documents included articles, e-mail correspondence, evaluations, and memorandums. Some documents were as small as four pages while others had over 100 pages.

### Sorting Documents

1. Documents with no information pertaining to reengineering and documents written before October 1995 were not used. Approximately 90 documents remained.
2. Information in the documents was coded according to four broad categories (see Appendix A for what types of information fall under each category):
  - a. empowered staff and teams accountable for results
  - b. addressing development needs through customers and partners
  - c. results-oriented decision-making
  - d. responsive and flexible approaches for achieving

3. Documents were classified in the following way:

*Background* -- documents that do not contain assessment of reforms, but provide background information on reengineering.

*USAID/W*

General -- documents pertaining to AID/Washington or documents generated from a central bureau

G/PHN -- documents from G/PHN

G/DG -- documents from G/DG

G/HCD -- documents from G/HCD

*Regions*

AFR -- documents from or pertaining to AFR

ANE -- documents from or pertaining to ANE

ENI -- documents from or pertaining to ENI

LAC -- documents from or pertaining to LAC

*Non-USAID* -- documents written by organizations other than USAID

*Guidance/Reference* -- documents that do not contain assessment of reforms, but provide guidance on, or reference to, reengineered concepts

## **Analyzing Data**

1. Information from documents classified as Background or Guidance/Reference was not analyzed. Information in each document classified as USAID/W, Region, or Non-USAID was divided according to the four broad categories (empowered staff and teams accountable for results, addressing development needs through customers and partners, results-oriented decision-making, and responsive and flexible approaches for achieving) and within each category divided into three sets (comments, things that worked well/best practices, and recommended action).
2. Data in each set were clustered according to topic to extract major themes.
3. Major themes from the comment section were tallied and prioritized by frequency. These themes create the snapshot.
4. Major themes from the things that worked well/best practices section are highlights, or examples of stated positive impacts of the reforms.
5. Major themes from the recommended action section were tallied and prioritized by frequency. These themes represent needs or areas that need to be improved.

### III. FINDINGS

The first part of this section provides information on the number of documents gathered and analyzed, as well as a breakdown of type of information within each type of document. The findings do not provide data on how much information of each type was found in each document.

The second part of this section discusses the content of information found. Each outcome area has a snapshot which contains a picture of the outcome area rated by frequency. In addition to the snapshot, each outcome area has a section on highlights and needs. Highlights are examples of things that were stated as working well under reengineering. Needs are both problems and proposed solutions to problems within categories. Appendices B-E provide the specific examples. The third part of this section discusses the findings.

#### Overview of Documents

Table 1. Number of Documents Gathered and Analyzed. (See attached bibliography.)

Type of Document	Number Analyzed	Number Not Analyzed
BACKGROUND		4
USAID/W	(32)	
General	22	
Global/PHN	7	
Global/DG	2	
Global/HCD	1	
REGIONS	(38)	
AFR	16	
ANE	8	
ENI	4	
LAC	10	
Non-USAID	3	
Guidance/Reference		11
TOTAL	73	15

Table 2. Type of Information Found in Each Type of Document.

Type of Document	Empowered Staff and Teams Accountable for Results	Addressing Development Needs Through Customers and Partners	Results-Oriented Decision-Making	Responsive and Flexible Approaches for Achieving
USAID/W (32)	18	11	7	23
General (22)	14	9	5	16
Global/PHN (7)	1	2	1	6
Global/DG (2)	2	0	0	0
Global/HCD (1)	1	0	1	1
REGIONS (38)	26	25	12	25
AFR (13)	10	10	6	13
ANE (8)	6	7	1	3
ENI (4)	3	3	1	1
LAC (10)	7	5	4	8
Non-USAID (3)	2	2	2	3
TOTAL (73)	46	38	21	51

## Specific Content

Empowered staff and teams accountable for results (see Appendix B for details)

*Snapshot (46 documents)*

Categories are listed in order of frequency.

### 1. Confusion about organizational structure:

Many documents discussed confusion due to multiple organizational structures. In the missions, USAID staff are confused about how to reconcile a team structure with traditional offices. Specific problems that arise are how support staff are integrated into teams, how decisions are made when there are both team leaders and office managers, and how to include people who work in the office structure on teams without increasing their workload. (21 documents)

### 2. Teamwork is effective:

There is general agreement that the teamwork approach can be effective. (15 documents)

### 3. Problems with incentives/evaluations/reward systems:

The documents that discussed problems with incentives, evaluations, and reward systems went into great detail. The main issue is that current reward systems do not reflect the reengineered core values. Although teamwork is encouraged, rewards are



based on individual achievement. In addition, there is a discrepancy among reward systems for U.S. direct hires, FSNs, and PSCs. The rewards and incentives discussed in the documents were not necessarily monetary awards, but emphasized recognition. (13 documents)

4. Change takes time:

A number of documents expressed the understanding that reengineering takes time and that change is a time-consuming process. These comments were not made in a negative way, but showed understanding of the situation. (13 documents)

5. Importance of leadership to institute change:

Many documents stressed the need for leadership to provide a unified statement showing commitment to reengineering. (12 documents)

6. Role of FSNs has increased:

Documentation shows that the role of FSNs has increased due to reengineering. Teamwork has provided FSNs with more responsibility and the emphasis on customer focus has provided an opportunity for FSNs to play a stronger role in the relationship with host country residents. Although the responsibilities have increased, the compensation for FSNs has stayed the same. (11 documents)

7. Importance of training:

Training in two major areas was emphasized in the documents: the importance of teambuilding so that people know how to work in the reengineered environment, and the importance of skillbuilding so that people are trained to perform the new tasks assigned to them due to reengineering. (10 documents)

8. Problem with position descriptions:

Reengineering and teamwork have changed the roles and responsibilities, but the position descriptions have not been updated to reflect these changes. (9 documents)

9. Importance of communication:

Communication within missions, among bureaus, and between Washington and the field is essential for the Agency to be effective. (7 documents)

10. Lack of guidance/clarity:

The guidance that exists is inadequate. Policy guidance from Washington is often unclear or contradictory and is clarified by the regional bureaus. Thus, missions receive guidance from central bureaus as well as their regional bureaus. Multiple guidance regarding the same issues causes more confusion. Also, there is lack of clarity over roles and responsibilities. Since there is confusion over the integration of teams and offices, and position descriptions don't match what people think they are supposed to be doing, there is a need for clarity on who is supposed to do what. (7 documents)

## *Highlights*

Due to the confusion and chaos, many missions have tried to make sense of things by implementing their own policies and norms. There are many examples of successful organizational structures and ways to implement reengineering within a mission. The majority of the highlighted organizational structures emphasize the importance of not having a dual system (offices and teams).

There are also examples of successful ways to implement teams. This includes team structures, how to promote teamwork, using external consultants for team building, establishing team procedures, and integrating work of SO teams within an operating unit.

The lack of a reward system has led missions to create their own awards. Many missions have set up incentives for teamwork.

Finally, the need for training resulted in Missions setting up their own programs for understanding reengineering, for team building, and for cross-cultural management.

## *Needs*

Many needs were cited in the area of empowering staff and teams accountable for results. There is the need to improve the reward system to reflect teamwork, for equality among USDHs, FSNs, and PSCs, and regarding closeout. There is a need for clarity on roles and responsibilities and a need to fix position descriptions and to provide training. There is the understanding that leadership is needed for success and clarity on commitment and expectations. There is a need to work on teamwork to create ownership of teams, to monitor the teaming process, to increase flexibility for teams, to include support staff in reengineering efforts, to strengthen teamwork and other core values. There is a need to improve Washington-field relations and for better communication between groups working on similar issues, for regional collaboration, and inter-office/team relations. There is a need to define limits of empowerment, to pay attention to workforce needs, and minimize and standardize organizational structures. Finally, there is a need to evaluate reengineering process and take action.

Addressing development needs through customers and partners (see appendix C for details)

## *Snapshot (38 documents)*

Categories are listed in order of frequency.

### 1. Partner/customer relations have improved:

The overwhelming message from the documents regarding partner and customer relations is that the relationship between USAID and its partners and customers has improved since reengineering began. (19 documents)

2. Procurement process affects partner/customer relations:  
Documents show that there is a belief that the procurement process negatively affects partner/customer relations. (6 documents)
3. Importance of partnerships and communication with partners:  
There is general agreement that partnerships are important. (6 documents)
4. Confusion: Importance of clarifying role of partners:  
There is confusion over how to involve partners. Contradictory messages from procurement and generated from the core values raise the need to clarify what role partners are supposed to play and how they can play it. (5 documents)
5. Lack of customer focus/ownership:  
Although the documents suggest that the relationship with customers has improved, there is the understanding that there is a lack of customer focus in, or ownership of, activities. (3 documents)
6. Reforms affect internal processes more than partnerships:  
There is the belief that the reengineering process is more focused on USAID's internal processes than on partnerships. (3 documents)

### *Highlights*

There are many examples of successful techniques for better communication with partners and customers. There are also examples of methods to formalize partnerships. Finally, there are examples of missions explaining reengineering concepts to partners.

### *Needs*

There is a strong sense for a need to move forward with partnerships and make them daily business. There is also a belief that partners need to understand reengineering. There is a need for leaders to clearly communicate expectations with regard to customer focus and partner relations. There is a need to improve customer focus, to hold partners accountable, and to clarify roles for partners and customers. Finally, there is an understanding that customers must feel ownership for sustainability to occur.

Results-oriented decision-making (see Appendix D for details)

### *Snapshot (21 documents)*

Categories are listed in order of frequency.

1. Budget is not based on performance:  
There is a strong belief that budget decisions are not based on results. Earmarking is

seen as contradicting "managing for results." People don't believe that the budget is based on performance, and they don't see incentives for "managing" for results, but rather for "achieving" results. This leads to dishonest reporting, obsession with indicators (particularly quantitative ones) and unrealistic Results Frameworks. (6 documents)

2. Confusion over meaning of and guidance for managing for results:

There is confusion over what is meant by "managing for results." The term "managing for results" itself causes confusion. This leads to more confusion since people are using the same term to mean different things. Because there is confusion over the meaning, there is also poor and/or contradictory guidance on managing for results. Guidance coming from central bureaus is embellished by the regional bureaus which can lead to guidance overload or mixed messages. (5 documents)

3. Improved focus on results:

There is a sense that there is improved focus on results, and that this is a good thing. (4 documents)

4. Activities forced to fit under SO:

Some activities do not fit neatly into the SO framework, but because they exist and have to fit somewhere, they get squeezed in. Similarly, the necessity of having all activities fit under a small number of SOs inhibits the possibility of identifying new areas of opportunity. (2 documents)

5. Importance of focusing on long-term results:

There is agreement with the overall concept of having a results-oriented approach to development. (2 documents)

### *Highlights*

There were no highlights cited for this category.

### *Needs*

There is a strong need for consensus on what "managing for results" means and for guidance and examples. There is a desire for the need to fight earmarking. There is a need to fight quantification of results and to put resources into achieving results rather than in the process. There is a need to update lessons learned, and to find the balance between focus on concrete short-term impacts for customers and more abstract long-term goals for development.

Responsive and flexible approaches for achieving (see Appendix E for details)

*Snapshot (51 documents)*

Categories are listed in order of frequency.

1. Problems with procurement:

There are contradictions between contracting and participatory principles for development. There is the problem of how to hold grantees accountable. There is also a problem due to the numerous restrictions over which funds can be used for what. (12 documents)

2. Lack of clear guidance on procedure and policy:

The lack of clear guidance on procedure and policy (particularly regarding the R4s) has led to inconsistent processes. (12 documents)

3. Importance of measuring/tracking impact/information:

Although people understand the importance of measuring impact and tracking information, there is a preoccupation with quantifying indicators. Many people are collecting any information they can find versus having a strong knowledge base for an issue. (9 documents)

4. Positive experiences using approaches:

A number of documents discussed positive experiences with new approaches, such as electronic databases and planning processes. (9 documents)

5. Importance (and lack) of training (for staff and for partners):

Lack of training has resulted in ineffective use of some of the approaches that are currently available to staff. For example, people do not know how to locate and use the ADS. (9 documents)

6. Results-orientation problems:

There is discussion over the rigidity of results frameworks, results packages, and R4s. Some say that these approaches prohibit creativity. There is also the issue of whether they encourage “managing” for results or “achieving” results. “Managing” means effective management of programs to achieve results in the longterm, whereas “achieving” means producing immediate results. (6 documents)

7. Importance of flexibility, and lack of it:

There is agreement that flexibility is important to work effectively, but that in most cases (particularly with procurement) the approaches are not flexible. (6 documents)

8. Washington controls the field:

The missions feel that Washington is in control, especially regarding the budget.

There is also the feeling that Washington doesn't take mitigating circumstances into account. (6 documents)

9. Problems with reporting:

There are too many reporting requirements. There is also the feeling that inaccurate reporting is rewarded. There are no incentives for reporting poor performance. This inhibits learning from experience. (5 documents)

*Highlights*

There are few positive examples for this category. Highlights include development of a supplement for position classifications, an extensive intranet site, use of Lotus Notes, and a delegation of authority form for SO team leaders to delegate authority to activity managers. There are also examples of new databases used to help with decision-making.

*Needs*

There is an overwhelming need for more guidance and clarity on issues such as R4s, results frameworks, managing participation and procurement, and reengineering in general. There is the need to increase delegations of authority, to fix the NMS, to increase training, and to reduce and improve reporting requirements. There is a need for strong leadership and a consistent message to USAID staff and the public regarding Agency goals. There is a need for a better evaluation and reward system. There is a need for a systematic system for measuring results and impact.

**Discussion**

The major themes raised by USAID staff and partners based on information gleaned from 73 documents can be divided into three sets of comments: those that provide positive feedback regarding reengineering, those that reflect confusion, and those that point out contradictions.

In general, people feel that the core values, particularly teamwork, are good ideas. They understand and accept the fact that organizational change takes time. They also feel that partner/customer relations have improved.

There is a strong feeling that guidance on policy issues is creating more confusion than assistance. The lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities (for individuals and teams) also creates confusion. The roles of customers and partners are still unclear to many staff and partners. This leads to confusion over how to involve customers and partners in the development planning process.

Finally, a number of tensions, or areas of contradiction, are identified in the documents. First, there is tension between the core values and the procurement process. Second, there is

tension between the core values and the budget process, and third, there is tension between the core values and the reward system.

The documents provided many examples of success stories. These lessons learned should be shared across the Agency to assist in eliminating confusion and contradictions.

Five specific needs were expressed in the documents:

1. Need to issue a shared vision about the role of the Agency and how it interacts with partners.
2. Need to provide consistent guidance on policy issues.
3. Need to clarify organizational structures and how roles and responsibilities fit into them.
4. Need to ease the tension between the rhetoric of the core values and the reality of procurement and budget.
5. Need to institute a reward system that matches the rhetoric of the core values.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. BACKGROUND

Center for Development Information and Evaluation. 1996. *Agency Performance Report*. USAID, Washington. (PN-ABZ-860)

Pryor, Tony. N.d. Private communication to Diane La Voy. "Reengineering Next Steps - Diagnostic." Washington.

United States Agency for International Development. 1996. *Toward the New USAID II: Three Years of Reform Progress*. Washington.

United States Agency for International Development/Business Area Analysis Team for Operations. 1995. *Making a Difference for Development: Reengineering the U.S. Agency for International Development's Program Operations*. Washington. (PD-ABW-997)

### II. USAID/W

#### General

A & A Task Force. *Acquisitions and Assistance Action Plan*. Draft.

A & A Task Force. *Presentation of Task Force Recommendations*. Presentation materials.

A & A Task Force. *Summary of Findings: Agency-wide Customer Survey*. Appendix B.

A & A Task Force. *Synopsis of Findings of Previous Reviews of Acquisition and Assistance Activities*.

Addleton, Jonathon et al. November 1996. *Managing for Results in a Regional Mission: USAID/Central Asia's Experience*. Reengineering Best Practices No. 6. USAID, Washington. (PN-ABY-231)

Barker, Terry. [tbarker@usaid.gov]. "G Center Directors Meeting, Wednesday, November 12." Private e-mail message to Diane La Voy, [dlavoy@usaid.gov]. 12 November, 1997.

Bethune, Turra. March 1996. *Country Experimental Laboratories: One Year Later*. Reengineering Best Practices No. 1. USAID, Washington. (PN-ABY-270)



- Brown, Keith et al. September 1996. *Planning and Managing for Results with Teams, Customers, and Partners in the Reengineered USAID: Observations from the Field*. Reengineering Best Practices No. 5a. Management Systems International, USAID, Washington. (PN-ABY-228)
- Bureau Transition Coordinators. November 1997. "Strategic Objective Issues." Washington: USAID.
- Carduner, Olivier. March 1996. *Reengineering at USAID/Bolivia: Why We Did What We Did*. Reengineering Best Practices No. 3. USAID, Washington. (PN-ABY-272)
- Forbes, Phyllis. September 4, 1996. Memorandum to Larry Byrne. "Reengineering Status Report: In the Middle of the Tunnel." Washington.
- Garber, Larry. February 15, 1998. Memorandum to Interested Persons. "Strategic Planning and Reengineering: Impressions from the Field." Washington.
- Gormley, Wilma. March 1996. *Building Teamwork in USAID's Dominican Republic Mission*. Reengineering Best Practices No. 2. USAID, Washington. (PN-ABY-271)
- Grayzel, John A. et al. July 1996. *A Partner's Consultation: Reengineering Relationships*. Reengineering Best Practices No. 4. USAID, Washington. (PN-ABY-223)
- Planning and Managing for Results under Reengineering: Early Lessons from the Field*. Reengineering Best Practices No. 5b. October 1996. USAID, Washington. (PN-ABY-229)
- PRISM. November 1993. *Managing for Results: Experience in Two USAID Missions*. Managing for Results Working Paper No. 1. USAID, Washington. (PN-AAX-284)
- Pryor, Tony. June 20, 1997. Private communication to Jill Buckley. "Upcoming Retreat: Field Comments and Issues." Washington.
- Pryor, Tony [tpryor@usaid.gov]. "Del of Authority: final version," in RFNET-1, [rfnet-1@info.usaid.gov], 26 January 1998.
- Pryor, Tony [tpryor@usaid.gov]. "Reengineering One Year Out -- RFNET Reflections," in RFNET-1, [rfnet-1@info.usaid.gov], 25 October 1996.
- RFNET. "The RFNET Review." July 1996-December 1997. (4 postings)
- United States Agency for International Development. 1997. *New Partnerships Initiative: A Strategic Approach to Development Partnering*. Washington.

Workforce Planning Task Force: *Report to Steering Group*. N.d.

### **Global/PHN**

Adamchak, Susan E. and Lynne Cogswell. November 1996. *Final Evaluation of the Population Reference Bureau Cooperative Agreement*. Proj. Nos. 936-3046 and 936-3024. Population Reference Bureau, USAID, Washington. (PD-ABN-497)

Cornelius, Dick [rcornelius@usaid.gov]. "Common Indicators." Electronic conversation among PHN staff. 30 December, 1997.

Cornelius, Dick [rcornelius@usaid.gov]. "Customer Survey." Electronic conversation among PHN staff. 30 December, 1997.

Cornelius, Dick [rcornelius@usaid.gov]. "Results Reporting". Electronic conversation among PHN staff. 30 December, 1997.

Cornelius, Dick [rcornelius@usaid.gov]. "Strategic Planning." Electronic conversation among PHN staff. 2 January, 1998.

Liberi, Dawn. N.d. Memorandum to Lorie Dobbins. "G/PHN Comments on Strategic Objective Issues." Washington.

Global/PHN Center. February 1998. "Global Bureau Center for Population, Health and Nutrition Work Process Items Recommended for Review and Modification." Memorandum. Washington.

### **Global/DG**

Center for Democracy and Governance. February 1996. "Organizational Analysis." G/DG retreat.

Center for Democracy and Governance. May 1994. "Themes and Issues." G/DG retreat.

### **Global/HCD**

Otero, Cecilia. September 1997. *Training as a Development Tool*. Academy for Educational Development, USAID, Washington. (PN-ACA-630)

### III. REGIONS

#### AFR

97 Maputo 001597. April 16, 1997. Cable. *Performance Review: A Numbers Game.*

AFR/W. *Notes on the R4 Guidance.* N.d.

Dobbins, Lorie B. *Africa Bureau R4 Process and BBS Presentation.* USAID Memorandum. July 11, 1997.

Inserra, Anne, and Janet Tuthill. 1997. "Analysis of Key Issues Emerging from the Africa Bureau FY 1994 Assessment." Washington: USAID.

Manrique, Lynne et al. September 1996. *Final Evaluation of the Botswana Private Enterprise Development Project.* Proj. Nos. 633-0253 and 940-0026. Coopers and Lybrand, L.L.P., USAID, Washington. (PD-ABN-209)

Matt, Lisa et al. 1996. *Action Program for the Environment Mid-term Evaluation.* International Science and Technology Institute, USAID, Washington. (PD-ABM-708)

Putnam, Eliot et al. February 1996. *Final Evaluation of the Niger Family Health and Demography Project.* Proj. No. 936-3024. Population Technical Assistance Project, USAID, Washington. (PD-ABM-488)

Reform Team. "Observations and Findings of the Reform Initiative Field Team: Visit to USAID/Madagascar." February 3-7, 1997.

Reform Team. "Observations and Findings of the Reform Initiative Field Team: Visit to USAID/Mali." February 10-14, 1997.

Reform Team. "Observations and Findings of the Reform Initiative Field Team: Visit to USAID/Senegal." February 16-21, 1997.

Schlesinger, Joel. December 1994. "The Impact of Results." USAID/Mali.

United States Agency for International Development. May 1996. *Project Assistance Completion Report: Swaziland Training and Institutional Development Project.* Proj. No. 645-0231. Washington. (PD-ABN-138)

United States Agency for International Development./Mali. N.d. *Re-Engineering Issues for REFORM Team.* Washington.

United States Agency for International Development./Senegal. October 1996. *Thoughts on*

*Re-engineering.*

United States Agency for International Development./South Africa RTF. January 30, 1996.  
Memorandum to J. Brian Atwood. "Reengineering USAID/South Africa." Washington.

USAID/South Africa. *One day of meetings on January 31.* N.d.

**ANE**

Kapustin, Wendy, and Anne Sweetser. "Engaging Customers in Activity Design."  
Participatory Practices: Learning from Experience. Washington. USAID. (PN-ABZ-560)

McPhie, Emily. 1996. "Participation in USAID/Bangladesh."

Pragma Corporation, Inc. 1995. *Industrial Environmental Management Project.* Evaluation Summary. Proj. No. 492-0465. USAID, Washington. (PD-ABM-508)

Reed, Alan. [Alan [Reed@RT@Dhaka](mailto:Reed@RT@Dhaka)]. "Reform Visit and USAID/Dhaka." Private e-mail message to Dirk Djikerman, [Dirk [Dijkerman@ANE.SEA@AIDW](mailto:Dijkerman@ANE.SEA@AIDW)]. 12 March, 1997.

Reform Team. "Findings of the Reform Review: USAID/Egypt." June 1-5, 1997.

Reform Team. "Observations and Findings of the Reform Initiative Field Team: Visit to USAID/Bangladesh." February 23-27, 1997.

United States Agency for International Development. 1996. *Energy Management Consultation and Training Project.* Evaluation Summary. Proj. No. 386-0517. Washington. (PD-ABM-984)

Wilson, John D., and Mohamed Mghizou. 1995. *Mid-Term Evaluation: New Enterprise Development Project.* Proj. Nos. 608-0204 and 940-0001. Washington: USAID. (PD-ABM-529)

**ENI**

Maltby, William A. and Jonathan Sperling. March 1996. *Evaluation of Agricultural Cooperative Development International's Farmer to Farmer Program to the New Independent States.* Proj. No. 938-0705. USAID, Washington. (PD-ABN-204)

Pressley, Don [Don [Pressley@AA.ENI](mailto:Pressley@AA.ENI)]. "POT Functions." Electronic message to ENI staff. 3 February, 1997.

Reform Team. May 1997. "Findings of the Reform Review: USAID/Hungary." Draft.

Reform Team. May 1997. "Findings of the Reform Review: USAID/Russia."

## **LAC**

Carduner, Olivier. "The Future of Project Development and Program Officers in USAID: One View from the Field." USAID/Bolivia. N.d.

Charles, Chanya. December 1997. "Procurement Alternative for Collaboration: USAID/Bolivia's Chaco Initiative." Participatory Practices: Learning from Experience. Washington. USAID. (PN-ACC-040)

Estes, Valerie. June 1995. *The Herns Project: Training for Development -- USAID/Bolivia Evaluation*. Proj. No. 511-0584. Aguirre International, USAID, Washington. (PD-ABL-678)

Reform Team. April 1997. "Findings of the Reform Review: USAID/Bolivia."

Reform Team. April 1997. "Findings of the Reform Review: USAID/Dominican Republic."

Urist, Steve, and Robert Lovato. February 1996. *Evaluation of Pilot Courts: Judicial Reform II Project*. Proj. No. 519-0376. USAID, Washington. (PD-ABM-880)

United States Agency for International Development/Bolivia. "Draft Discussion Paper: Mission Organization and Re-engineering."

United States Agency for International Development/Bolivia. September 1996. "Minutes of the September 10, 1996 Re-engineering Steering Committee (RSC) Meeting." United States Government Memorandum PD&I-M-208/96.

United States Agency for International Development/Bolivia. October 1996. "Mission Awards and Training Process." United States Government Memorandum.

Wingert, Steve et al. March 1996. *Economic Policy and Practices Project Evaluation Summary*. Proj. No. 517-0262. Management Systems International, USAID, Washington. (PD-ABM-540)

## **IV. NON-USAID**

Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. June 1997. *An Assessment of the State of the USAID/PVO Partnership*. Washington. USAID.

Center for Naval Analysis. 1997. "Key Issues and Approaches for the USAID Operations (OPS) System." Washington.

U.S. General Accounting Office. 1996. *Report to the Chairman, Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives*. Washington.

## **V. GUIDANCE/REFERENCE**

97 Washington X778382. January 6, 1997. Cable. *FY 1999 Results Review and Resource Request Guidance*.

Baltimore, Elizabeth et al. June 1997. *Teamwork 101: A guide for USAID team members*. Washington: USAID.

Country Experimental Lab (CEL) Reports.

Center for Development Information and Evaluation *Transition Guidance Cables*.

1. "Rollout of the Reengineered USAID Systems"
2. "Transition to Reengineered Operations Processes"
3. "NMS Infrastructure"
4. "New Management Systems (NMS) Applications Software"
5. "Customer Service Planning"
6. "Transition to Reengineered Operations Processes - Achieving"
7. "Results Framework Development"
8. "Automated Directives System (ADS)"
9. "Teamwork and USAID's Reengineered Operations Systems"
10. "Performance Monitoring and Evaluation"

"LAC Bureau Strategic Plan/R4 Clarifications and Description of Review Process"

Results Team Leaders. November 1996. Memorandum. "Results Team Annual Report/Portfolio Review." George Carner. Washington.

*Strategic Objective Two Pact Between Health and Population Team and USAID/DR Mission Director*. Appendix II. June 1, 1995 - March 31, 1996.

United States Agency for International Development. *On Track*. Articles of interest. Washington.

"The New Ops System: Results Framework." Vol. 1, No. 3, July 1995.

"Projects, Strategic Objectives, Activities" Vol. 1, No. 5, September 1995.

"Organizing Work: Results Packages." Vol. 1, No. 6, October 1995.

"A View to Development." Vol. 1, No. 7, November-December 1995.

"Customer Service Plans: Fact or Fiction?" Vol. 2, No. 1, January 1996.

"Reflections on Results Framework Development." Vol.2, No. 1, January 1996.

"The Mailbag." Vol. 2, No. 4, June-July 1996.

"A Contractor's View: Performance-Based Contracting." Vol. 2, No. 5, July-August 1996.

"The Nature & Use of Strategic Objective Agreements." Vol. 2, No. 6, September 1996.

"Reengineering Observations." Vol. 3, No. 2, February-March 1997

"Reform Initiative." Vol. 3, No. 4, May 1997.

"United States Agency for International Development/Bangladesh change management process." 1995.

"United States Agency for International Development/Bangladesh: Re-engineering Transition Plan." Draft. N.d.

United States Agency for International Development/Peru. 1996. "Draft Procedures for Approving Activity Designs and Amendments."

## **APPENDIX A: Outcome Areas**

### **Empowered Staff and Teams Accountable for Results**

- authority
- control of decision-making
- control of resources
- delegation: Washington/operating unit/team/individual
- staff and team skill levels
- incentives and consequences
- tie to results

### **Addressing Development Needs Through Customers and Partners**

- role of partners and customers in:
  - planning
  - resource generation
  - implementing
  - monitoring
  - problem solving
  - achieving sustainable results
- customer service plan

### **Results-Oriented Decision-Making**

- role of data about results in:
  - planning (problem definition, strategy, implementation design)
  - resource allocation
  - implementation (contracts/grants)
  - monitoring and problem solving
  - human resource management
  - revising problem definition, strategy, implementation design, contracts and grants, human resource management
- relationship of risk to results oriented decision-making

### **Responsive and Flexible Approaches for Achieving**

- ADS
- customer focus and service plan
- NMS
- management contract
- participatory evaluations
- performance-based contracts
- performance monitoring and monitoring plan
- R4 report and review
- results driven evaluations
- results frameworks
- results packages
- strategic plan
- World Wide Web



## APPENDIX B: Empowered Staff and Teams Accountable for Results

### SNAPSHOT

THEME	regions ( 26 )	usaid/w ( 18 )	non-usaid (2)	total (46)
<b>Confusion about organizational structure:</b> Teams/offices; support staff; team composition; who makes what decisions	15	6	0	21
<b>Teamwork is effective:</b> Yes, teamwork can work	11	3	1	15
<b>Problem with incentives/evaluations/reward system:</b> No rewards for teamwork; discrepancy between DH, FSNs, and PSCs	11	2	0	13
<b>Change takes time:</b> Reengineering is a long-term process; time-consuming	7	4	2	13
<b>Importance of leadership to institute change:</b> Need unified statement of commitment to reengineering	10	2	0	12
<b>Role of FSNs has increased:</b> Responsibility increased, compensation stayed the same	10	1	0	11
<b>Importance of training:</b> Teambuilding, skillbuilding; not short-term	7	2	1	10
<b>Problem with position descriptions:</b> They don't match with reengineered roles and responsibilities	8	1	0	9
<b>Importance of communication:</b> Within missions, bureaus; between Washington and the field	5	2	0	7
<b>Lack of guidance/clarity:</b> Policy guidance; clarity over roles and responsibilities	2	5	0	7
<b>Washington has power over the Missions:</b>	3	2	1	6
<b>Empowerment has increased</b>	5	1	0	6
<b>Washington is a poor example for reengineering</b> Haven't changed the organizational culture	2	1	1	4
<b>Accountability isn't really enforced</b>	1	1	0	2
<b>Importance of flexibility in staffing</b>	1	1	0	2
<b>Problems with DOA</b>	2	0	0	2
<b>Lack of empowerment</b>	1	1	0	2
<b>Micromanagement has increased</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Importance of regional collaboration</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Disconnect with Embassy</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Importance of including all staff</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Division between program and procurement staff</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>Discrepancy between strategy and resources</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>Focus should be on sustainable development</b>	0	0	1	1
<b>Focus of reengineering is on teams</b>	0	0	1	1
<b>Mission authority has increased</b>	0	0	1	1

## **HIGHLIGHTS**

### **Structure**

#### *Organizational Structure*

- Combined Project Development and Implementation Office, Program Development Office, and Economics division into the Office of Strategy and Operations Services (Bolivia)
- Eliminated technical offices from the beginning and organized teams through a participatory process (Mali)
- Maintained parallel structure to provide security/flexibility for staff to learn about team behavior (Madagascar and Philippines)
- Issued mission orders that dissolve technical offices and explicitly establish SO teams as the principal management units in charge of operations (South Africa)
- Maintained both technical offices and SO teams but preliminarily defined clear lines of responsibility and authority between them (Russia)
- Kept both offices and teams and issued mission orders that address areas of potential ambiguity (Morocco)
- Organizational structure and management style adapted to fit strategic plan: delegation of program decision-making authority; interdisciplinary teams involving several offices; functional criteria for team membership; clear and manageable roles and functions of teams (USAID/Guatemala)

#### *Process Issues*

- Developed a “road map” (six month transition plan outlining steps to be taken, transfers of authority and responsibilities presented to staff for review and comment) to guide reengineering process. Consensus approach helped limit anxiety in the process (Bolivia)
- Team building was built into daily routine, employed a consultant for several weeks each quarter, ongoing (Mali)
- "Framework for Reengineering" used as blueprint to guide process (Senegal)
- Two-year contract for a full-time resident organizational development specialist (Mali)
- Reengineering Task Force-- served as a major catalyst in the progression of the reengineering effort (South Africa)
- Establish norms for team behavior, break large teams into smaller units, rely on partners
- Minimize chaos/resistance upon introduction of reengineering: neutralize skepticism before it becomes cynicism; provide staff with a sense of control over the process; build and maintain credibility of training team; motivate staff to work extra hours to be successful. (Bolivia)
- Design training program around addressing legitimacy, minimizing time requirements, timing (Bolivia)
- Initial reengineering briefing was followed by a reading series (Bolivia)
- One-day, off-site training course built staff enthusiasm (Bolivia)
- Senior management decision to delegate all legally possible authority to SO team (Bolivia)

- Semiannual project implementation reviews (PIRs) (Kenya)
- Biweekly meeting of management and technical staff (Kenya)
- Mission leader and staff clarified the role of the front office (USAID/Dominican Republic)
- New employee orientation package for those coming in from nonreengineered posts (Mali)

## **Teams**

### *Team Structure*

- Designated one member of the environmental SO team to serve as a liaison to other SO teams (Bolivia)
- Support staff envoys to SO teams increased efficiency (Bolivia)
- Inclusion of finance staff on SO teams (Bolivia)
- Because of use of multifunctional teams, most support staff now serve on SOTs, participating actively and fully in decisions affecting design and implementation at earlier stage than under prereengineered circumstances. (Bangladesh)
- Teams have wide parameters and overlap. Overlap of teams produces synergy; better integration across the Mission (Hungary)
- One team developed a mascot and symbol to create a sense of team identity (Hungary)
- Overarching strategic team provides guidance on programmatic matters for mission's SO and to SO teams (budget across SOs, SO team membership, monitoring activities) (South Africa)

### *Promoting Teamwork/Empowerment*

- Provide adequate number of meeting rooms; include at least one standard work object concerning teamwork in personnel evaluations; encourage use of electronic calendar/issue newsletter (Philippines)
- Contracts, charters, or pacts between each team and Mission management to address accountability (Bangladesh, Jamaica, Philippines, Madagascar)
- Mission director has actively discouraged senior managers from overriding any decisions made by SO teams (Russia)
- Each SO team asked to develop a "Strategic Objective Pact" (Jamaica)
- One SO team established joint team leadership (i.e., SO team contracts between teams and mission management, joint team leadership) (Kenya)
- Entire mission (67 participants) attended a half-day team-building workshop (Dominican Republic)
- Experience of USAID/Dominican Republic staff is a good example of how to initiate effective teamwork (Dominican Republic)
- Create a team learning framework (Dominican Republic)
- Provide regular feedback to team leaders (Dominican Republic)
- Consider how extended team members are used (Dominican Republic)
- SO teams must learn to coach (Dominican Republic)
- RP teams need startup activities (Dominican Republic)
- Empower FSN staff (Dominican Republic)
- Front office must keep coaching (Dominican Republic)

- Maintain a positive attitude (Dominican Republic)
- USAID/Dominican Republic—SO teams drew up loose code of conduct for team leaders

#### *Use of External Consultants for Team Building*

- Brought in a Jamaican consultant and an Embassy staff member to conduct team-building workshops (Jamaica)
- Identified a local consultant to help team members acquire team-relevant skills and to increase strength and effectiveness of Mission's teams (Jordan)
- Brought in external team building experts or trainers (Mali, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Poland, REDSO/ESA, and Regional Mission for Central Asia)

#### *Team Procedures*

- A large SO team's coleader developed meeting procedures which entire team reviewed and agreed to observe; also established smaller internal “rump team” within large team (Kenya)
- Made collective decision to establish intermediate results teams as principal unit for engaging in strategic planning and management efforts (Nicaragua)
- Has a small staff and could not assemble SO teams of adequate size so it invited partners, resulting in a more dynamic, productive, and effective SO team (Paraguay)
- DOA framework: provisional delegation of authority framework (Madagascar)

#### *Coordinating and Integrating Work of SO Teams Within an Operating Unit*

- Recognized need to increase communication across individual SO teams and held large mission-wide meetings at which SO teams presented their results framework (Ukraine)
- Senior mission managers formed an executive council to which SO teams are required to present their SO statements, results frameworks, and performance monitoring plans (Russia)
- Established an Overarching Strategic Team (OST) responsible for addressing cross-cutting programmatic issues (South Africa)

#### **Reward/Evaluation system (incentives)**

- Pilot FSN evaluation program (Bolivia)
- Employee Development Committee to deal with performance objectives, evaluations, incentives, awards (Dominican Republic)
- Revised evaluation form for FSNs and USPSCs (Dominican Republic)
- Employee of the Month: all employees vote, winner receives a shirt (South Africa)
- Innovative award and incentive program: Core Values Award, Teamwork, Shakespeare, On-the-Spot team awards (details on each) (Madagascar)
- Bag of Marbles Award to honor outstanding contributions to reengineering effort (Dominican Republic)
- Out of the Box Award for the most creative ideas/suggestions (Mali)
- Glitch Award for a new solution to an old problem (Philippines)
- Director's award for SO or RP team with best results for the year (Philippines)
- Deputy director's award for teamwork (Philippines)

#### **Training**

- Intensive workshops held to help employees, partners, and stakeholders understand the process (Bolivia)
- Two-day in-service training program, Activity Manager Implementation Refresher Course (Russia)
- Cross-cultural management dynamics training to resolve inter/intra office conflicts (Jamaica)

## **NEEDS**

### **Need to Improve Reward System**

#### *Reflect Teamwork*

- Should create incentives to reward teamwork (Hungary)
- Should use Agency's Incentive Awards Program to support teamwork and results (Russia)
- Must play a pivotal role in creating a motivating environment conducive to teamwork and supportive of the Agency core values and reengineering initiatives. Should establish the framework for an effective incentives program. Should begin the process now of developing incentive plans that include monetary and non-monetary recognition. Use of the *Results-Oriented Incentives Reference Guide* as a tool in this process (Egypt)
- USDH promotion and evaluation system needs to reflect team emphasis (Senegal)
- Need revised promotion criteria (Mali)
- Evaluation process should reflect team structure, consider individual as well as team accomplishments (Senegal)
- Evaluation should be based on contribution to specific results as described in RP and team workplan (Senegal)
- Reward employee performance and reinforce integration of core values (A&A Task Force)

#### *Equality issues*

- Should consider \$25,000 procurement authority for qualified FSNs (Hungary)
- Agency needs to work to provide equal treatment for all workforce categories with specific attention to the adversarial negotiation process of USPSC contract (Hungary)
- Adopt a policy of 360-degree feedback for all employees (Russia)
- Increase FSN inclusion and participation (Russia)
- Mission must make a conscious effort to empower USPSCs (Hungary)
- Consider instituting a system of 360-degree feedback for all employee evaluations. (Egypt)
- Do FSN rating on cyclical rather than anniversary date (Bangladesh)
- Use 360-degree feedback with differences from USDH system (Bangladesh)
- Written evaluations of team members by team leaders should include 360-degree input (Bolivia)
- Compensation for team leader only should be reconsidered (Bolivia)
- Agency should ensure that awards and incentives are available to all staff (USPSCs, FSNs) (Bolivia)
- OP should revisit policy on Mission approval of awards for USPSCs (Dominican Republic)

- Written evaluations of SO team members by team leaders should include 360-degree input (Dominican Republic)
- Employees performing similar duties should be treated equitably (Senegal)
- PER process is not reengineered. FSNs should benefit from evaluation process tied to SOs (Bolivia)
- Need incentives for OP personnel (A&A)
- Need to improve FSN benefits

#### *Close-out issues*

- Should consider offering “close-out” bonuses for employees who stay through the final days (Hungary)
- Should consider offering non-monetary assistance to FSNs who remain through close-out such as assistance in obtaining a diploma from a Western university (Hungary)

### **Need for Clarity**

#### *Roles and Responsibilities*

- Must define roles, responsibilities, and authorities of teams (Russia)
- Need to clarify the respective roles of the Mission Director, deputy director, management support team (formally the Executive Committee), and the reengineering steering committee in implementing the reengineering program. (Egypt)
- Need to resolve issue of who rates – team leader or former supervisor. Must be consistent worldwide (Bangladesh)
- Each staff member should have clear responsibilities that relate directly to the Mission's SO (Bolivia)
- Need to review SO team membership to ensure that staff involved in achieving results are on the team (Bolivia)
- Supervisors should not second guess FSNs with direct activity management responsibility (Bolivia)
- Structure should be reexamined to ensure appropriate levels of accountability (Bolivia)
- Teams should be a forum for discussion of difficult issues (Bolivia)
- The following criteria recommended when considering full-time assignment of support staff to SO teams: 1) support office should maintain some degree of oversight; 2) employees should have strong technical skills and be able to work independently; 3) employees in training levels will require more oversight by technical expert; 4) responsibilities and roles should be clear (Senegal)
- Need to clarify roles, responsibilities, and expectations; clearly define policy communication terms and activities; and establish clear long-distance communication time frames and protocols (Pop eval)
- Must develop FSN career paths and compensation packages to increase retention
- Must clarify role of FSN on SO and RP teams
- Need to clarify rules

### *Commitment and Expectations*

- Need to clarify commitment to using multifunctional SOTs, which take advantage of support office participation. Can be done either at the results package or SO level, and can be done differently for different SOs, with the aim of building an optimal core team size of five to ten people for implementing the SO (Egypt)
- An Agency-wide democracy accountability ecology must be established to explicitly detail who has authority to create and approve democracy initiatives (DG)
- DG Center leadership must be told whether budget and personnel will be increased to levels which will allow the Center to fulfill goals expressed in the original mission statement (DG)
- The question of the application of reengineering, in particular authority and accountability, to the creation of the Center must be resolved (DG)
- AID/W can provide clarification on some points of tradeoff or conflict among key changes occurring as a result of reengineering
- Clearer guidelines aimed at empowerment

### **Need to Fix Position Descriptions**

- Need for a comprehensive review of existing position descriptions. While changes to employees' assigned duties and responsibilities are not universally the result of reengineering, the REFORM team endorses the Mission's decision to bring in classification specialist/consultant on TDY to conduct such a comprehensive review. (Egypt)
- FSN position descriptions should be revised (Bolivia)
- Procurement specialist job description should be revised (Bolivia)
- Should not be a change to SO team members' series allocations (Bolivia)
- Uniform position descriptions should be simplified (Bolivia)
- Position descriptions need to be revised (Dominican Republic)
- Agency needs to clarify the role of USPSCs: are they contractors or employees? (Dominican Republic)
- Should undertake an extensive effort to revise all position descriptions (Dominican Republic)
- Must modify job classifications and descriptions to reflect new roles and responsibilities (Mali)
- Need to revise FSN classifications (South Africa)
- Agency guidance on how to classify mixed positions, training in FSN classification for EXOs and local staff personnel lists is recommended (Madagascar)
- Must redefine job descriptions (Bolivia, Mali)

### **Need Leadership for Success**

- Senior management must play role in creating a motivating environment conducive to teamwork and supportive of the Agency core values and reengineering initiatives. (Forbes, A&A Task Force)
- Consider having a senior USDH staff member as an alternate Joint Awards Committee member in order to make USAID's case for awards, especially when award nominations are more technical and when reengineered language is used. (Egypt)

- Management representatives should attend already scheduled SO team meetings (Bolivia)
- should consider following M4 (Monthly Meeting with Mission Management) practice of USAID Dominican Republic (Bolivia)
- Leadership skills must be emphasized in recruitment of senior positions (Mali)
- Agency organizations should be aware of managerial skills and personality in selecting team leader (Madagascar)
- The success of reengineering begins with acceptance and implementation by leadership (DG)
- Top leaders need to discuss overall vision and goals (DG)
- Demonstrate committed leadership by communicating the operational vision and emphasizing corporate accountability (A&A Task Force)
- Foster ownership of change process by communicating findings, assigning staff to follow-up recommendations, and post recommendations (A&A Task Force)
- Missions need tangible support from AID/W (TA, training in results management, etc.) and evidence of AID/W's commitment to reengineering
- Senior managers should clearly communicate their reengineering vision and expectations to missions, units, and offices; link expectations to available resources where possible
- Senior managers must do more than issue directives: provide tangible support for reengineering, including sharing information about what isn't working
- Demonstrate commitment to reengineering
- Provide further guidance or help in resolving important reengineering implementation issues
- Need explicit doctrine for OPS system (CNA)

### **Need Training**

- Training needed for updating skills, orientation for new employees transiting from nonreengineered post, and team building (Bangladesh)
- Need thought on assigning mentors or trainers for staff going to different occupations (Bangladesh)
- In missions where embassy does classifying, must provide training to embassy personnel (Bangladesh)
- Need to upgrade technical and management skills of SO teams (Bolivia)
- Need for program implementation training (Bolivia)
- Need to upgrade technical skills of SO team members. Time and resources must be made available, as well as cross training (Dominican Republic)
- Should make sure that staff training is a key component (Bolivia)
- Training needed in NMS, COTR training for FSNs, team building, backstop and general skills development, on-site OJT training for FSNs (Madagascar)
- USAID/W must make training a priority at all levels (Madagascar)
- Need to provide training (A&A Task Force)
- A renewed commitment to training is a prerequisite for success (NPI)
- Should continue periodic team building training (Dominican Republic)
- Need reengineering information available through training; need financial support for this (Mali)
- Should provide facilitation training/use facilitators (Mali)



- Should emphasize staff development over new operational mechanisms (Dominican Republic)
- Should provide teamwork training to sustain staff participation (Mali)
- Should provide staff training and orientation to reengineering process

## **Need to Work on Teamwork**

### *Need to Create Ownership of Teams*

- Key FSN and USDH employees should be engaged in a participatory process in the beginning to create ownership and operationalize teamwork (South Africa)

### *Need to Monitor Teaming Process*

- Agency needs to continue to monitor the teaming process (Madagascar)

### *Need Flexibility for Teams*

- Teams must be flexible (re: membership) (Madagascar)

### *Need to Include Support Staff in Reengineering Efforts*

- Need to expand reengineering efforts to include support staff; consider inclusion on SO teams (pros, cons included) (Madagascar)

### *Need to Strengthen Teamwork, Other Core Values, and Competencies (A&A Task Force)*

- Increase annual investment in development of staff's technical and organizational skills ; professional training
- Break down current organizational insulation and improve working relationships through organizational development techniques
- Increase staff understanding of, and respect for, roles and responsibilities
- Increase employee willingness for wise risk-taking

## **Need to Improve Washington/field relations**

- Approaches agreed upon by mission should also be applicable to Washington (Bolivia)
- Need to develop strategies to increase participation of Washington virtual SO team members (Bolivia)
- Budgets should include TDY support for virtual team members (Dominican Republic)
- Must revisit delegation of authority between the field and USAID/W (Guatemala)
- Need regular communication from Washington to the field on issues such as changes in ADS and R4 requirements (RFNET)

## **Need for Better Communication**

### *Between Groups Working on Similar Issues*

- Ongoing discussion and information exchange must be established between all Agency offices involved in the democracy process (DG)

#### *Regional Collaboration and Communication*

- Regional conferences and networking are necessary to increase productivity and ingenuity among AID staff (NPI)
- An NPI web site, providing information and links to other resources, would improve information exchange and debate (NPI)

#### *Interoffice/Team Relations*

- Mission must facilitate interoffice/team relations through nurturing the system

#### **Need to Define Limits of Empowerment**

- Must define limits and parameters of empowerment (Mali)
- Should recognize the foundation of empowerment is accountability; accountability needs more work
- Strategies need to be developed to deal with those who do not want additional authority or involvement in the team process
- Missions need to see that the Agency's senior managers are protecting flexibility and empowerment from what appears to be growing layers of AID/W guidance and requirements
- Strive to improve reengineering's new processes and policies and to protect Mission flexibility and empowerment
- Need to empower and hold people accountable (Forbes)
- Need to improve USPSC treatment (Mali)

#### **Need to Pay Attention to Workforce Needs**

- Workforce should be a function of needs and budget independent of workforce categories (Mali)
- Lift the hiring freeze now! (Mali)
- Need to improve workload management (A&A Task Force)

#### **Need to Evaluate Reengineering Process and Take Action**

- The Agency should evaluate reengineering process to date and begin a second phase with appropriate management support, focus and allocation of resources (DG)
- Teams must evaluate progress towards goals at regular intervals

#### **Need to Minimize Number of Organizational Structures and Have Standards**

- Should pursue decision to phase out technical offices during FY 1998 and possibly accelerate the process (Bolivia)
- All missions should implement SO team contracts or pacts (Bolivia)

#### **Need to Focus on Design Process**

- Must spend more time in the beginning on a design process instead of products (Bangladesh)

#### **Need Resources**

- Secure needed resources which will support reform of the A&A process (A&A Task force)

## APPENDIX C: Addressing Development Needs Through Customers and Partners

### SNAPSHOT

THEME	regions (25)	usaid/w (11)	non-usaid (2)	total (38)
Partner/customer relations have improved	14	3	2	19
Procurement process affects partner/customer relations	4	1	1	6
Importance of partnerships and communication with partners	3	3	0	6
Confusion: importance of clarifying role of partners	0	5	0	5
Lack of customer focus/ownership	3	0	0	3
Reforms affected internal processes more than partnerships	2	0	1	3
Importance of customer feedback	0	2	0	2
Varied strategies for customer focus/partner relations	0	2	0	2
Strained relationship with embassies and USG agencies	2	0	0	2
Imp. of focusing on long-term realistic view of partners	1	0	0	1
Partners feel threatened	1	0	0	1
Contradiction between accountability and partner usage	1	0	0	1
Imp. of building on assets and not spreading self too thin	1	0	0	1
Difficult to implement customer/partner focus in ENI	1	0	0	1
Performance indicators don't capture results of subgrantees	1	0	0	1
Problem of USAID micromanagement	1	0	0	1
Difficult to collaborate with indigenous groups	1	0	0	1
Importance of FSNs in partner/customer relations	0	1	0	1
Partners concerned with impacts, not abstract goals	0	1	0	1
Reporting requirements too onerous for partners	0	1	0	1
Funding has shifted from PVOs to PVO activities	1	0	0	1
Regional priorities and country closing have mixed impact	0	0	1	1
Reform application is uneven	0	0	1	1
Partners pushed to operate within the USAID framework	0	0	1	1
PVOs don't understand reengineering	0	0	1	1
Too much focus on start/stop activities; no continuity	0	0	1	1

## **HIGHLIGHTS**

### **Techniques for Better Communication With Partners/Customers**

- Open Assistance Meeting, monthly event focusing on a specific theme or issue at the embassy for key embassy staff, partners, contractors and host country counterparts (Hungary)
- Town Hall meeting is a monthly event for the Local Governance team along with partners and donors; has a specific focus (Hungary)
- Rapid Appraisal Technique (Bangladesh)
- Competition to select partners was conducted prior to strategic planning, therefore competition among partners was avoided (Bangladesh)
- Improved internal customer service and teamwork prior to implementing core values to external customers (Jamaica)
- Enhanced customer focus: customer needs assessment survey and free trade survey; customer service plan design by SO; luncheons and seminars for partners, stakeholders, customers (Jamaica)
- Mission-wide ownership by including mainly FSNs from staff and technical offices on customer service plan working group (Madagascar)
- Workshop on participation and empowerment for partners and community representatives (Madagascar)
- Two rapid appraisals of customer needs, one before and one just prior to completion of strategic planning (Bangladesh)
- Held three all-day meetings to address partner/customer unavailability for numerous meetings (Mali)
- Involving partners in activity reviews helps reduce implementation problems
- Used in-house rapid appraisal techniques and contracted surveys to obtain customer input. Formed a participation /customer service working group to develop guidance for strategic planning and consultation with partners and customers before developing results framework (Ghana)
- Customer focus reengineering team commissioned a Customer Needs Assessment Survey through a local consulting firm; information was fed into development of the results framework and will be used by SO teams when they work with their partners to design results packages (Jamaica)
- One SO team employed a three-stage process for interacting with its partners. Prior to initial drafting of the results framework, SO team met with partners and discussed relevant issues for the sector, then core SO team met and developed a draft RF. Lastly, SO team went back to partners for feedback. Partner input included in initial stages, but core SO team did not feel pressure from partners when developing actual RF (Lithuania)
- SO team used recent nationwide survey of agriculture and microenterprise sector to develop first draft and presented RF at a seminar to partners; seminar functioned as expanded team exercise and resulted in RF refinement (Kenya)
- With only one U.S. direct hire, mission involved partners from the initial stages of strategy development (Paraguay)
- Involved partners in early stages, not because it is a small mission but because it felt that

ideas from different sectors and hands-on perspectives of implementing partners were the best way to get shared ownership and responsibility for joint programs; approach worked well partly because the mission is small so planning group was a manageable size (Romania)

- Involved all key development partners and customer reps in development of a five-year strategic plan and RF; partners eagerly participated in many meetings (Paraguay)
- One SO team involved a broad set of partners on its expanded team during the RF development (Kenya)
- Stressed the importance of involving a complete set of partners; one team broke into subteams when it grew too large but still involved partners (Jordan)
- Made effort to put teamwork, empowerment and accountability, results, and customer focus to the test in its Partners Conference on Coalitions and Civil Society—results outstanding (Philippines)
- Mission's Office of Voluntary Cooperation (OVC) historically holds an annual meeting with NGOs; new Office of Governance and Participation (OGP) changed meeting's character in response to reengineering
- New conference: Annual Partner's Conference held October 13-16, 1995 resulted in more client-oriented partnership

### **Techniques to Formalize Partnership**

- Use of purchase order to formally collaborate with indigenous group (Bolivia)
- Signed written contracts are essential in cases where false expectations or misunderstandings are likely to result (NPI)

### **Partner Relations**

- Met with 12 to 15 partners to discuss their experience with reengineering (Bolivia)
- Criteria for success: continuous and inclusive surveys of those issues important to both customer and partner; direct responses to issues raised, including modifications to programs and strategies when necessary; acceptance of nontraditional partnerships and ideas; willingness to pursue and achieve new relationships, including cross-sectoral collaborations (Haiti-NPI)
- Workshops held with partners introduced reengineering and core values and facilitated interactive thinking process focused on results (Madagascar)

## **NEEDS**

### **Need to Move Forward with the Partnership -- Make It Daily Business**

- Partners suggested that M4s be periodically expanded to include partners (Dominican Republic)
- Every effort should be made to move this partnership forward (Niger-evaluation)
- Issue of donor coordination should be given greater attention than in the past (Niger-evaluation)
- USAID should construct program whereby donor activities are complemented, effort minimized, and coherent private sector strategy developed (Niger-evaluation)
- Regular communications relating to design and progress of programs should be set up among all private sector donors (Niger-evaluation)
- Regular exchanges between USAID contractors should be obligatory and facilitated by the Mission (Niger-evaluation)
- Need to work more with partners to develop plans (pop eval)
- Need frequent meetings among stakeholders to keep all involved in the design process (Bangladesh)

### **Need to Explain Reengineering to Partners**

- Partners should understand reengineering (Mali)
- Should extend reengineering beyond the Mission by: 1) sharing information; 2) making improved communications a priority; 3) team building for partners; 4) model customer focus and responsiveness; 5) mutual commitment and accountability; 6) orient thinking and action toward results (Mali)
- Embassy needs to be brought up to date on reengineering; on some teams it is appropriate for embassy staff to be members (Bangladesh)

### **Need Leaders to Clearly Communicate Expectations**

- AID/W and senior managers can communicate clearly their expectations with regard to teamwork and customer/partner participation (Reeng5a)
- Mixed messages to USAID missions and USPVO field offices must be made consistent in regard to traditional controls and PVO-defined objectives (Bolivia)

### **Need to Improve Customer Focus**

- Need to follow up on customer surveys already completed (Bolivia)
- SO team-level customer focus should serve as an example for other missions (Bolivia)
- Need system for customer feedback

### **Need to Hold Partners Accountable**

- Partners should be held accountable (Mali)
- Need to strengthen USAID's role of supervising and supporting activities, particularly in area of reviewing contractors (India-evaluation)

**Need to Clarify Roles**

- Recipients should be defined as partners (Bangladesh)
- Assign one person on each SO to be responsible for outreach, liaison, communication (internal and external) (Mali)

**Must Ensure Customer Ownership for Sustainability**

- Effort must be made throughout program lifetime to promote ownership in order to ensure continuation in absence of funding (Botswana-evaluation)

**Need Team-Building Exercise with Partners**

- focus some team-building efforts outside Mission to include partners, embassy staff, etc. (Mali)

## APPENDIX D: Results-Oriented Decision-Making

### SNAPSHOT

THEME	regions (12)	usaid/w (7)	non-usaid (2)	total (21)
<b>Budget is not based on performance:</b> Earmarking contradicts managing for results	3	2	1	6
<b>Confusion over meaning of and guidance for managing for results</b>	4	1	0	5
<b>Improved focus on results</b>	2	2	0	4
<b>Activities forced to fit under SO</b>	0	1	1	2
<b>Importance of focusing on long-term results</b>	1	0	1	2
<b>Overemphasis on tangible results is dangerous</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Decreased flexibility due to managing for results</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Issue of timing of resource allocation</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Confusion when SO changes</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Shorter horizon allows for focusing on results</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>Difficult to relate activities to results</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>Lack of decisions based on monitoring system</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>SO framework is useful</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>Managing for results vs. achieving results</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Use of "results center"</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Unrealistic indicators</b>	0	0	1	1
<b>Assumption that results are achieved through contracts</b>	0	0	1	1



## **HIGHLIGHTS**

NONE

## **NEEDS**

### **Need Consensus on What "Managing for Results" Means as well as Provide Guidance and Examples**

- Consensus on what is meant by “managing for results” is needed and examples should be identified and distributed at the time the R4 guidance is issued (Afr-R4 analysis)
- Must continue to push for shared vision (Senegal)

### **Need to Fight Earmarking**

- Must continue to fight earmarking and directives of special interests (Senegal)

### **Need to Fight Quantification of Results**

- Must recognize and inform Congress that results are not quantifiable in the short term (Senegal)

### **Need to Put Resources into Achieving Results, not Just the Process**

- Resources have been shifted from achievement of results to the process (Senegal)

### **Need to Update Lessons Learned (pop eval)**

### **Need to Focus More on Short-Term Impacts for Customers**

- New concepts and designs should focus and promote direct benefits and impact on beneficiaries (Philippines-evaluation)
- People affected and involved should see direct benefits, not those coming 10 to 20 years after the project (Philippines-evaluation)

## APPENDIX E: Responsive and flexible approaches for achieving

### SNAPSHOT

THEME	regions (25)	usaid/w (23)	non-usaid (3)	total (51)
<b>Problems with procurement:</b> Contradictions between contract principles and participatory development; between grants and accountability; which funds being used for what	6	6	0	12
<b>Lack of clear guidance on procedures &amp; policy</b> (esp. R4): Has led to inconsistent processes; problems with ADS	5	7	0	12
<b>Importance of measuring/tracking impact/information:</b> Problems; preoccupation with quantification-- collecting any information vs. having a strong knowledge base	4	5	0	9
<b>Positive experiences using approaches:</b> Menu of activities, ICA, MEASURE, MER, GIS, indicators, strategic plan/objectives	4	4	1	9
<b>Importance (and lack) of training (for staff, for partners)</b>	1	7	1	9
<b>Results-orientation problems:</b> RFs, RP teams, value of R4, prohibits creativity, achieving vs. managing for results?	1	3	2	6
<b>Importance of flexibility (and lack of it)</b>	3	3	0	6
<b>Washington controls the field:</b> esp. budget -- causes problems in field, mitigating circumstances aren't taken into account	3	2	1	6
<b>Problems with reporting:</b> Too many requirements; what are incentives for reporting poor performance?	4	1	0	5
<b>Problems with NMS</b>	1	3	0	4
<b>Poor development hypotheses</b>	3	1	0	4
<b>Process problems:</b> Proposal review, evaluation, HR, overwhelmed by process	2	2	0	4
<b>Workload management issues</b>	0	3	0	3
<b>Importance of information flow</b>	1	1	0	2
<b>Imp. of leadership/understanding how decisions are made</b>	0	2	0	2
<b>Improved development hypothesis</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Issue of delegations of authority</b>	1	0	0	1
<b>Division between technical and procurement staff</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>Change takes time</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>Focus on assets and build on them</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>Lack of analysis</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>Micromanagement</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>Improved streamlined processes</b>	0	1	0	1
<b>Imp. of single approach to collect data on partnerships</b>	0	0	1	1
<b>Preference for contracts</b>	0	0	1	1
<b>Rhetoric vs. practice</b>	0	0	1	1
<b>Tension in performance-based contracts</b>	0	0	1	1
<b>Operational vs. strategic viewpoints</b>	0	0	1	1
<b>Evaluations by missions: not done systematically</b>	0	0	1	1

## **HIGHLIGHTS**

### **Position Classifications**

- Development of a supplement to Local Employee Position Classification Handbook (Bolivia)

### **Intranet Site**

- Extensive intranet site with action plan, operating procedures, functional assignments, and personnel files (Russia)

### **Lotus Notes**

- Use of Lotus Notes for personnel directory with team composition, SO and RP profiles, team documents library, team "dialog" organized by team's workplan objectives, searchable design documents (Philippines)

### **MER**

- Used MER findings to inform policy dialogue, direct use of resources, inform decisionmaking, influence program components, revise framework, etc. (Kenya)

### **APT**

- Used APT to demonstrate program impact, communicate impact, plan strategically, and refine strategic framework (Kenya)

### **TRAINET**

- The training results and information network represents an Agency-wide information management system for training that provides a consistent framework for systematic data input and collection, and enables quantitative and qualitative analyses of training practices using standardized data formats.

### **Delegation of Authority Form**

- DOA form for SOT leaders to activity managers

## **NEEDS**

### **Need more Guidance and Clarity**

#### *Need Clear R4 Guidance (Afr-R4 assessment)*

- Decisions should be made regarding R4 requirements and clearly explained for next year including how much and what type of information should be included\_\_\_\_(p 5) (p 6)
- Principle of reporting by exception should be reconsidered\_\_\_\_(p 6)
- R4 guidance should be sent out at the end of November or early December for March R4\_\_\_\_(p 7)
- Consider page limit per SO\_\_\_\_(p 8)
- Performance data tables should be treated as annexes\_\_\_\_(p 9)
- Specified range of pages should be provided per SO\_\_\_\_(p 9)
- Page limits should be uniformly enforced\_\_\_\_(p 9)
- Copies of results framework graphics should be provided for each SO in annex for program context and ease of reference\_\_\_\_(p 9)
- Technical reviewers and desk officers should have increased, regular exposure to operating unit programs
- Examples of good R4 narratives should be distributed to all AFR operating units when guidance is issued\_\_\_\_(p 15)
- R4 guidance should include clear instructions on how to address content and process issues arising from CSP and R4 simultaneous submissions\_\_\_\_(p 15)
- Relationship between performance and budget allocation needs to be clarified and reexamined\_\_\_\_(p 16)
- 65% black box/nonperformance part of scoring should be more transparent, explicit, readily explainable\_\_\_\_(p 16)
- Agency must be explicit about R4 purposes and expectations and examine the feasibility of each\_\_\_\_(p 19)
- Predominant emphasis of SO should be scored by the most informed technical reviewers in the sector\_\_\_\_(p 20)
- Explicit formats and means must be found for senior bureau management to participate in process; AA meetings with each field unit, weekly 2-hour wrap-ups, 1-hour sum-ups at the end of each program day\_\_\_\_(p 26) (p 29)
- Clear concise supplementary information on the mechanics and details of R4 review should be sent to operating units; simpler and earlier is better\_\_\_\_(p 28)
- Performance scoring should be revised: simpler system with 3 or 4 categories or same system with meeting targets and neutral revisited\_\_\_\_(p 28)
- Procedures for reviewing performance of SOs funded by multiple budget categories should be revised so that a single sector technical review group takes the lead on each SO and there is no double rating of any SO\_\_\_\_(p 28)
- Review process should be streamlined (details included)\_\_\_\_(p 28)
- Consider conducting full review of R4 only every other year\_\_\_\_(p 28)
- Guidelines, norms, and oversight mechanisms should be developed for the technical review

committees\_\_\_\_(p 28)

- Milestones for providing feedback to operating units should be set to cover timeliness, consistency, and establishing points of contact\_\_\_\_(p 29)
- Norms should be established with operating units for sharing information, requests for information, participation, and feedback expectations\_\_\_\_(p 29)
- Operating units should be represented \_\_\_\_ (p 29)
- Best practices on internal operating unit communication should be shared\_\_\_\_(p 29)

#### *Need Clarity and Guidelines for Results Framework*

- Need a set of standard guidelines for elements to be included and those that stand separately in results framework (Niger)
- Guidelines needed for what/how much should be included in results framework
- Ideas needed on managing activities overlapping RPs and SOs
- Strategies needed for cross SO issues
- Clarity needed on conflict of interest situations
- General consensus that more guidance is needed
- Guidance regarding selection/definition of SO is clear but should be reinforced by supplementary guidance to underline how AID intends to manage by objective
- Need new guidance that proscribes/discourages splitting one SO into two, and prohibits shifting past budgets/allowances/obligations to different objectives
- Need clarification of policy guidance on how an objective is to be defined

#### *Need Guidance on Managing Participation and Procurement*

- Agency should develop guidance on how to manage participation and procurement

#### *Need Clearer Policy Guidance Related to Reengineering (CNA)*

- Suggesting a need for clearer policy guidance related to reengineering, interviews with USAID staff uncovered concerns that partner consultation could skew an anticipated procurement action. Rules and regulations regarding competition restrict interaction and involvement of both PVOs and NGOs in project design, strategy discussions, etc. These are important roles for partners. Some PVOs explained they avoid certain consultations for fear they would be characterized as having an unfair advantage in upcoming competition.

#### *Need to Improve Management of CN/TNs*

- Improve management of CN/TNs in LPA by developing clear format/content guidelines and improved procedures for moving/tracking CN/TNs through LPA to the Hill.

### **Need to Increase Training**

#### *Need Training*

- Much training needed, especially for new staff who did not go through last year of reengineering (Bangladesh)
- Must get training modules to field (Bangladesh)

#### *Need to Have Training Strategy*

- Recommendations for Mission's training strategy: 1) link training with SO and technical office, 2) impact measurement as part of training design, 3) mission-wide database on trainees and their impacts, 4) increase equitable distribution, flow-on as a part of training design and implementation, 5) increase efficient and effective use of training resources (Bolivia-evaluation)
- Future training projects should evolve from a needs assessment for each SO (Bolivia-evaluation)

#### *Need Training in Procurement Practices and Policies*

- Despite laudable procurement reforms, positive impact of reforms yet to be fully institutionalized. Implementation of reforms uneven. Staff requests more training in new procurement practices and policies.
- Several procurement officers underscored need for more training.
- Should develop models and train USAID/PVOs on use of performance-based assistance instruments.

#### **Need Strong Leadership/Consistent Message to USAID Staff and the Public**

#### *Need to Have Consistent Set of Objectives*

- One key to increasing acceptance of AID's new approach is to show Congress a consistent set of objectives from year to year
- Minimize changes to portfolio; never shift funds notified under one objective to another
- Exploratory program development and support costs should not be placed in a resulting objective even if money used for work that later becomes a new SO
- Need to communicate context and strategy for work

#### *Need Action and Acknowledgement from Leaders that Concerns are Valid*

- Need confirmation from Agency senior management that these concerns are valid. Need direction on how these issues should be handled
- Need to reestablish mutual respect for each other's work and to constantly improve own spheres of action, beginning with strong leadership

#### **Need to Reexamine and Revise Work Processes**

- Reduce staff time and administrative costs consumed by field support process by reexamining and revising mechanism used
- Clarify rules and regulations; provide clear guidance
- Speed up availability of OYB
- Delegate authority and responsibility through increased use of warrants
- Streamline procedures; streamline process by which field support finances A&A actions
- Balance workload throughout the year
- Institute continual improvement of mechanisms or process; use “learning organization” concept
- Need to streamline practices

- Need RP teams to do the work
- Need to realign workforce

### **Need to Increase Emphasis on Measuring Impact**

- Should increase emphasis on measuring the impact and use of materials produced, including development of simple evaluation tools to be published and used similar to the communications strategy framework.
- Develop routine system of updates and monitor usability of popnet web site
- Need to monitor progress
- Need to measure performance improvements and communicate them

### **Need to Increase Delegations of Authority**

- Delegations of authority for personnel management should at least equal those of program design (Mali)
- Agency should reexamine DOAs in procurement to minimize risk from down-sizing (options noted) (Madagascar)
- Delegation of authority: speed actions and reduce demands on senior staff by reexamining delegation of authority with the objective of further redelegation of items to DAA/Office directors.

### **Need to Fix NMS**

- NMS is a tool. It needs to be reviewed/modified to make it more useful.
- There are many examples of cross-center initiatives that cut across SOs. If NMS is not able to support such integrated activities, then solution is to change NMS so it reflects reality- not pretend that all activities and obligations pertain only to one SO.

### **Need to Reduce and Improve Reporting Requirements**

- Should limit reporting requirements to R4 (Senegal)
- Reduce time and effort required to produce and read a retrospective and prospective view of agency goals and accomplishments by combining APR and APP into single document reflecting continuum of activities
- Improve efficiency of R4s by shifting to biannual schedule to allow for better data collection/analysis and more attentive review of the results reported.

### **Need Better Evaluation and Reward System**

- Set up an evaluation system that serves as an incentive to perform well, improve skills and be accountable for our work. (Bangladesh)
- Need to better utilize and improve on an incentive awards system that promotes all of the above. (Bangladesh)
- Must first take better advantage of the existing awards program. (Bangladesh)

### **Need to Shift Emphasis from Design to Implementation**

- Agency should shift emphasis from design to implementation, evaluation, redesign (Senegal)

### *Need to Better Analyze Development Realities*

- Need to provide more appropriate designs (Morocco-evaluation)
- Need real and specific SOs

### **Need to Enhance Mission Control Over Personnel Resources**

- Enhance mission control over personnel resources
- Devolve budget/organizational/personnel management to operating units

### **Need to Plan for an Endpoint/Success**

- Planning for results means planning for success, and planning for success means graduation within a reasonable length of time.
- Endstate definition may require lengthier planning horizon – 10 to 15 years with continued tracking of results not being limited to point of graduation. Investments made within mission's existence should continue to bear fruit far beyond pullout date, and successes should be captured for both public accountability and public relations.

### **Need to Cut Across Sectors**

- OPS system was designed to break down barriers not only within sectors, but across them as well.
- Doctrine needs to encourage results packages (RPs), results frameworks (RFs) and SOs across sectors. This linking must occur most prominently in terms of monitoring and evaluation. If positive cross-sectoral spillovers cannot be identified within individual RFs, how can it be assumed that any such sustainability is being achieved across the SOs pursued by any one mission?

### **Need Flexibility: Money Should Flow Toward Development Opportunities**

- In demand-led funding stream, money should flow toward developmental opportunities as they arise and are identified, much like investment follows business opportunities in a free market economy.
- For this aspect of new OPS system to function correctly, RPs cannot be fixed units with lives of their own like the old USAID programs.

### **Need Mechanism to Capture Lessons Learned and Provide Doctrine**

- Should create some institutional mechanism to capture experience and from the bottom-up generate a doctrine that embodies the tenets of reengineering. Center of gravity must lie with missions. Need to build up a knowledge base at their level that overcomes problems of lack of institutional memory for which USAID is well known.

### **Need to Use Scenario Planning for RFs (CNA)**

- Should consider use of seminar-based gaming exercises within individual missions as way to test RF construction and to provide on-site personnel with valuable training in typical RF decision dynamics. Rather than nail mission down to single RF that is logically going to have to be reconfigured every year, missions should be encouraged to think across (and



present) a range of RF paths or structures. Idea underlying such training would be simulation of RF's lifetime, confronting mission personnel with artificial experience of living through the entirety of an RF and having to use adaptive planning techniques. If they are not sufficiently trained and don't understand critical nuances of new adaptive planning philosophy, the new OPS system is likely to suffer great dysfunctionality on implementation. Regular USAID contractors complain that they are undertrained in OPS system and do not understand workings well enough to engage in PBC realistically. Scenario planning would also help USAID become a better learning organization by reducing employees' perception of risk exposure and orienting their thinking more to learning as they go.

#### **Need to Document and Disseminate Partnership Best Practices**

- Should document and disseminate partnership best practices and should develop capacity building indicators.
- Should finalize policies and practices for strategic partnerships in nonpresence countries.
- Need data on features of partnership, especially on funding levels. There is perception that only larger PVOs are successful in working with USAID.

#### **Need to Have Mission-Wide Strategy and System for Measuring Results**

- Should develop a mission-wide strategy and implementation system for measuring results (Bolivia-evaluation)

#### **Need to Standardize Use and Review of SO Team Pacts and Contracts**

- Should institute regular review of SO team pacts and contracts (Dominican Republic)

#### **Need to Focus on Assets and Build on Them**

- Should consolidate existing set of activities with PRB and provide adequate funds to carry them out with full staff, instead of proposing elimination of activities or reduction of support.

#### **Need Clear Expectations for Partners/Customers**

- Establish clear expectations of partner/stakeholder/customer availability

#### **Need to Eliminate Contradictions Between Procurement and Core Values**

- Concerted effort with Office of Procurement and customers in participatory information exchange to address contradictions

#### **Need More Technical Assistance**

- More technical assistance needed to ensure program sustainability

#### **Need to Create Working Structures to Continue Reforms**

#### **Need Pilots to Try Out New Methods**